DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 229 RC 011 496

TITLE	State of Wisconsin Evaluation Conference Summary; E.S.E.A. Title I Migrant Education Programs Summer of 1978.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison. Div. for Management and Planning Services.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	20p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; Educational Objectives; Migrant Children; *Migrant Education; Organizational Communication; Program Design; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Summer Programs; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Techniques
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

In August of 1978 an ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) Title I education conference was held to obtain an evaluation of the migrant education programs operated in Wisconsin during the summer of 1978. Five forms were used to collect information from the 47 conference participants with specific forms directed toward instructional staff, classroom teachers, project directors, administrators-site coordinators-recruiters, and all participants. Questions were designed to (1) find how much or if the participants knew about a given topic; (2) obtain the participants' evaluation of a given topic; and (3) find out what action the respondent would recommend in a given area. Item content covered program goals and objectives, state plan, role definitions/division of authority, communication patterns, overall program design, program impact, and conference evaluation. When asked to list the greatest assets and weaknesses of the Title I migrant education project, teachers most frequently listed staff and educational opportunities that would otherwise not be offered as positive factors. Student/parent attitudes was the most frequently mentioned negative factor. The most successful materials, games and activities listed by teachers included tapes and cassettes, consonant bingo, finger plays and field trips. Directors were negative in their comments on the Migrant Student Record Transfer System. Tabular data are used to summarize participants' responses in the categories cited. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178229

MC Jul 12, 1979

RC

STATE OF WISCONSIN
EVALUATION CONFERENCE SUMMARY
E.S.E.A. TITLE I MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAMS
SUMMER OF 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Erpenbach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC 011496

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Division of Management, Planning and Federal Assistance
E.S.E.A., Title I Unit

Barbara Thompson, Ph.D. / State Superintendent

INTRODUCTION

The August 1, 1978, E.S.E.A. Title I migrant education conference was held to obtain an evaluation of the programs operated during the summer of 1978. This conference was attended by 6 DPI staff and 41 other persons representing CESA #13, the Texas Migrant Council, and 13 of the 15 Title I migrant education projects operated that summer. (Beaver Dam and Wautoma were not represented.)

Five separate forms were used to collect information from conference participants. (Copies of these are included in the appendix.) Job classifications were used to determine which forms participants would complete. (All conference participants were asked to complete form E, but only instructional staff completed forms A and B and only administrative staff completed forms C and D.) The number of response items per form ranged from 4 to 6 and since none of the items were repeated, a total of 27 items were used. The number of participants at the conference thus generated 341 separate responses. Both scaled responses and comments were reported. Table 1 summarizes the type of information collected from conference particpants.

TABLE 1

DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE AND RESPONSE

Form	Respondent Type	Number Respondents	Number of Items	Response Mode
A	Instructional Staff	5	7	Comments
B	Classroom Teachers	15	6	Mixed
C	Project Directors	16	6	Mixed
D	Administrators Site Coordinators Recruiters	14	4	Comments
E	All Participants	16	4	Comments
TOTAL 5		66	27	

The items were of three major types: 1) Those designed to find how much or if the participants know about a given topic; 2) Those designed to obtain the participants' evaluation of a given topic; and 3) Those designed to find out what action the respondent would recommend in a given area.

An item content analysis was done to summarize the large variety of responses. This analysis resulted in the following classification of items which will be used in the remainder of this report.

TABLE 2

ITEM CONTENT ANALYSIS

Item Content	Number of Items	Form and Item Identifier
Program Goals and Objectives	4	A1, B3, C1, C4
State Plan	3	D2, A6, E4
Role definitions/Division of Authority	7	A7, B2, C2, C3, D1, D3, D4
Communication Patterns	3	B1a, B1b, C5
Overall Program Design	6	A2, A3, B4, B5, A5, A4
Program Impact	3	E1, E2, E3
Conference Evaluation	1	C6
TOTAL	27	

PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Items A1 and B3 showed that 4 out of 5 teachers felt they knew their program's objectives for migrant children and that 11 out of the 15 teachers felt the clarity of educational goals in the classroom was "very good". In contrast, only 2 of the directors felt the state migrant program goals were "clear" to them and only 4 of the 16 felt curriculum objectives were "clear". (Items C1 and C4)

Fifteen of the directors' comments on program goals and objectives indicated a need for better dissemination: "The goals should be discussed for the benefit of all personnel, thus eliminating individual interpretations." However, 2 directors stated the objectives were clear in a broad sense, and 3 comments showed directors expected curriculum objectives to vary by program, year, or person. (One director even commented that programs should be "free to set" curriculum objectives.)

Evaluating objective/goal quality, one of the directors questioned why Spanish was being taught and another noted more objectives were needed in the affective domain.

Two of the teacher comments on educational goals indicated that they were affected by student mobility: "With children going and coming unexpectedly it is difficult even to assess each child's needs much less meet them"; and 2 indicated they were affected by student attitudes: "Students often unwilling to work toward attaining (goals)". Two of the teachers also noted that they preferred developing the educational goals: "I enjoyed the liberty of setting the educational goals for my classroom and modifying them as the educational needs of the children changed".

STATE PLAN FOR MIGRANT EDUCATION

Current Plan

Nine of the administrators, site coordinators and recruiters evaluating the state plan (item D2) indicated that they didn't have it: "I am not aware of the State Plan; it eliminates the possibility of using it to form the program"; and 7 commented that late funding and project approval affected program operations such as hiring staff or obtaining materials. Other single comments related to the state plan indicated it:

- was too broad and should contain instructional objectives
- was not applicable to local programs
- should provide more staff for the MSRTS
- should require inservice training.

Future Plans

Instructional staff and all participants were asked what other elements they would like to include in their programs. (Items A6 and E4) Suggestions mentioned more than once are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3

RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS

Frequency		Comment
Teachers	All Participants	
2	5	Swimming lessons
2	1	Ordering more materials
3	2	More field trips or community awareness activities
-	3	More pre-planning/teacher training
-	3	More information on students from other programs
-	4	Art, music, physical education
-	3	Hygiene/health
-	2	More transportation
-	2	Expand program (more students, operate longer)

Single comments from teachers suggested "time and place for non-competing activities" and "grouping children by age to provide advanced activities for older children". Single comments from all participants suggested "more individualization, a banquet, career education, better breakfast, and less testing".

ROLE DEFINITIONS/DIVISION OF AUTHORITY

Self Evaluation

Responses from forms B and C showed that 13 of 15 teachers felt they had a "very good" understanding of their job responsibilities but only 2 of the 16 directors felt administrative personnel responsibilities were "clear". Teachers' suggestions to improve job understanding included: offering more practical inservice, developing written guidelines, helping non-teaching staff to better understand their roles and providing teachers time when students were not present. (Each of these comments was mentioned only once.)

Administrators, site coordinators and recruiters perceptions of their own leadership role ranged from having a free hand in organizing project (2 responses) to filling out forms (3 responses). Other leadership roles cited

by administrators, site coordinators and recruiters included the following:

TABLE 4

ADMINISTRATORS, SITE COORDINATORS AND RECRUITERS' JOB TASKS

Frequency	Role
4	Initiating and operating projects
4	Coordinating activities
3	Inservice education
2	Implementing state and federal regulations
2	Support teachers/curriculum consultant
3	Working with parents
2	Get new program ideas
3	Manage resources

Problems Noted

Three of the directors commenting on administrative responsibilities cited internal conflicts or management problems at the state (DPI) level, and three noted lines of authority were unclear: "How is division of authority divided? Who do we go to for advice?"

Other single comments related to administrative responsibilities were that the state coordinator's role was unclear, that the state coordinator should be committed to migrant education, that CESA staff were helpful, and that late approval and poor information dissemination caused problems.

State Supervisory Position

One item focused only on the role of the state migrant supervisor. "How do you perceive the role of the state migrant program supervisor?" This item yielded a wide variety of responses, one of which envisioned a "bottom-up" rather than a "top-down" management structure. Thus 2 comments suggested the state supervisor should implement the recommendations of local project staff.

Further difference of opinion regarding lines of authority was illustrated by the respondent who suggested the supervisor should "administrate the overall program and let CESA deal with local sites and problems in local programs" versus the 3 commentors who felt the supervisor should help manage local programs: "The state migrant supervisor must have great input into the way programs are run (staffed, curriculum, etc). This person should oversee

projects (contracts, budgets, sites are selected on time), visit, monitor and evaluate programs."

Other responsibilities noted for the state migrant program supervisor are summarized below:

TABLE 5

OTHER TASKS FOR STATE MIGRANT SUPERVISOR

Frequency	Responsibility
6	Promote migrant education in Wisconsin
6	Be knowledgeable about migrant education/disseminate information
4	Facilitate planning at local level
3	Carry out ideas/promote new programs
1	Develop policy and goals

Needed State Services

To operate the migrant program at the local level, respondents requested the following services.

TABLE 6

MIGRANT PROGRAM SERVICES REQUESTED

Frequency	Service
6	Consultants to help operate program and PAC
5	Inservice
3	Coordinate services from various agencies
2	Early approval of local projects
1	Force school districts to provide facilities for migrant projects
1	Implement local recommendations
1	Food Service
1	Obtain funding
1	Disconnect MSRTS

Parent Advisory Councils

The final item related to role definitions dealt with parent advisory councils. Asked to rate the role of the parent advisory council, 6 of the 16 directors noted it was "unknown to me", 9 noted it "needed clarification", no one noted it was "clear to me", and 1 noted the item "did not apply".

In commenting on the PAC role, 6 respondents noted that more directives were necessary: "There should be an inservice for all program directors, to provide a uniformity of understanding". Two commentors also questioned the purpose of a PAC: "I am in an area of 99% true migrant - few settled out - and 100% field workers - not canning companies - the PAC is of little or no value". Other single comments on the PAC role were:

- It should facilitate parent awareness of Title I
- It should advise the SEA and LEA
- It should be individual by site
- It should just be at the state level
- It is difficult to get parent representation
- It can be "political"
- It has produced resentment from other migrant serving agencies and parents in the camps.

COMMUNICATION

Teacher Perceptions

Teachers had a favorable perception of the staff communication patterns in their programs. All of the 15 teachers completing form B rated staff communication "very good". In contrast, only 3 of the 15 teachers rated school-parent communication "very good", 9 noted it "needs improvement", 1 noted "none" (exists), and 1 rated it "not applicable". Teacher comments on school-parent communication noted they want more parent contact (3 comments), parents don't say much (2 comments), it was a negative influence (1 comment), and much is hear-say (1 comment).

Directors Perceptions

In addition to evaluating the quality of communications on program goals and objectives, the state plan, their job responsibilities, and purposes of the

parent advisory councils, (see previous sections), directors were also asked to comment on the MSRTS (Migrant Student Record Transfer System)--the computerized information system designed to provide achievement and health data on students. The comments listed are best characterized as negative. Five directors noted poor turn-around time, 4 stated the MSRTS was not working, 1 indicated the data provided was poor and 1 indicated the system was not appropriate for re-settled migrants: "Time spent does not have a pay off re: re-settled students".

Recommendations to improve the MSRTS included employing more staff and studying successful users.

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM DESIGN

Teachers were asked to list the greatest assests and weaknesses of the Title I migrant education project. A tabulation of their comments follows.

TABLE 7

TEACHER PERCEPTION OF PROGRAM ASSESTS AND WEAKNESSES

Factor	Frequency of Mention		
	As A Positive Factor	As A Negative Factor	Total
Staff (cooperation, communication, type employed)	9	4	13
Educational opportunities were offered which otherwide would not be	6	0	6
Field trips/activities	5	1	6
Freedom of teacher from supervision	2	1	3
Facilities	2	1	3
Health services	2	0	2
The daily schedule	1	0	1
Materials	1	0	1
Class size	1	1	2

TABLE 7 (Continued)

TEACHER PERCEPTION OF PROGRAM ASSESTS AND WEAKNESSES

Factor	Frequency of Mention		
	As A Positive Factor	As A Negative Factor	Total
Funding	1	2	3
Student/parent attitudes	1	5	6
Testing	0	4	4
Uncertain enrollment	0	2	2
Student attendance	0	2	2
Program Length (too short)	0	2	2
Multi-age groups	0	1	1
Outside influences	0	1	1
Inservice	0	1	1

Teachers were also asked tollist the most successful materials, games and activities used. Responses that were mentioned more than once included:

Tapes and cassettes
Newspaper (6-8) reporter
Consonant Bingo
Making popcord
Finger plays
Field trips

Other responses to these questions are listed in Appendix B.

Asked about objectives that they were not able to accomplish, teachers listed; art projects, individualized attention, language experience, creative writing and swimming lessons. Lack of facilities or time were most frequently cited reasons for not accomplishing these objectives.

New methods or procedures which teachers tried during the summer of 1978 were also listed. (These appear in Appendix B.)

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IMPACT

Eleven of the 16 persons evaluating the impact of project services felt changes were "consistent enough to be educationally significant", but 5 didn't know if they were, or didn't feel the question was appropriate. The type of educational changes observed in students were wide-ranging. Table 8 summarizes those listed.

TABLE 8

EDUCATIONAL CHANGES IN STUDENTS OBSERVED BY STAFF

Frequency	Observed Change
9	Language/verbal skills
5	Attitudes toward school
4	Reading skills
4	Readiness skills
3	Writing skills
3	Math
2	Career awareness
3	Group skills/social independence
2	Following directions
1	Reading for pleasure
3	Cultural Enrichment (Phy Ed, Art)
1	Social Studies
1	Science

Although 1 respondent noted all benefits were educational, other project staff also noted a variety of non-educational impacts.

TABLE 9

NON-EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IMPACTS NOTED BY STAFF

Frequency	Impact
14	Health/nutrition
5	Knowledge of community
5	Social development
3	Positive attitude toward self
4	Cultural Enrichment (Music, Art, Phy Ed)
2	Food
2	Recreation
2	Parent Involvement
2	Transportation
1	Field trips
1	Cooking skills
1	Provided more jobs for teacher aides

THE EVALUATION CONFERENCE

The most frequent comment (7) made regarding the annual state evaluation conference was that the information generated was not used: "Of what is said, there should be reactions by administration". On the positive side, four commentors indicated that the conference provided an opportunity for expression: "To air our views without prejudice"; and 1 teacher indicated the conference was "very necessary and useful".

Single suggestions to improve the conference included hiring professionals to plan it, and developing a standard criterion for evaluation.

IMPLICATIONS

Analysis of conference participants' responses suggests the following actions to improve the migrant program:

1. Distribute copies of position descriptions for directors, recruiters, aides and teachers along with the state plan and goals/objectives for migrant education programs prior to a preservice session for all staff.

2. Discuss same at preservice session.

3. Develop written policies regarding the PAC role. Distribute along with appropriate copies of the Federal Regulations to all migrant program staff.

4. Review staffing for MSRTS at project sites. Conduct at least 1 statewide inservice session for terminal users. Identify reasons for slow turn-around. Study successful users.

5. For project directors, develop a calendar of events for Wisconsin migrant projects illustrating reporting dates, application submittal dates, etc. Take necessary action (in-house) to prevent late project approval/funding.

6. Develop or distribute position description for the state migrant supervisor which delineates responsibilities vis-a-vis
   - USOE
   - SEA (other staff)
   - CESA
   - Local Project Staff

7. Prepare a 1 page fold-out brochure highlighting migrant program operations for statewide distribution to improve understanding across professional, parent, other migrant serving agencies and community groups.

APPENDIX A

FORM A

QUESTIONS - INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

1. Do you know your program's objectives for migrant children? If yes, how have these objectives been used to guide your teaching procedures, methods, techniques. If no, what guides did you use in lieu of program objectives?

2. What materials and games have you found to be particularly successful?

3. What activities were most effective in stimulating children to learn?

4. What classroom objectives were planned but were not accomplished? Why?

5. Did you try out any new methods, procedures or ideas during this summer? What were they and how did they work out?

6. What methods, procedures or ideas would you like to try? Are there any considerations which would facilitate or inhibit your trying them? What are they?

7. In what areas would you desire to have program input?

FORM B

(To be completed by classroom teachers before the conference)
Directors: Please bring along to the session

TITLE I-MIGRANT STATE EVALUATION CONFERENCE

August 1, 1978

Name of School _____

This is designed for use by all CESA #13 Title I-Migrant certified staff members.

Please rate each statement according to the following scale and add your comment:

1) None
2) Needs improvement
3) Very good

	(circle one)
1.a. Quality of staff communication comment:	1 2 3
b. Quality of school-parent communication	1 2 3
2. Understanding of your job responsibility comment:	1 2 3
3. Clarity of educational goals in your classroom comment:	1 2 3

4. What do you see as the greatest assets of the program?

5. What do you see as the greatest weakness of the program?

FORM C

(To be completed by Project Directors at end of session)

TITLE I-MIGRANT STATE EVALUATION CONFERENCE

August 1, 1978

This is designed to evaluate the State Title I-Migrant Program as a single unit. Please rate each area for clarity as follows:
(1) Unknown to me (2) Need some clarification (3) Is clear to me

	(circle one)
1. Goals of State Migrant Program comment:	1 2 3
2. Responsibility of Administrative Personnel comment:	1 2 3
3. Role of the Parent Advisory Council comment:	1. 2 3
4. Curriculum Objectives comment:	1 2 3
5. Utilization of the MSRTS Form comment	1 2 3
6. Function of State Evaluation Conference comment:	1 2 3

FORM D

QUESTIONS - ADMINISTRATORS, SITE COORDINATORS, & RECRUITERS

1. How do you perceive the role of the state migrant program supervisor?

2. What strengths or weaknesses do you see in the state plan that facilitates or inhibits the writing of your plans for operating a migrant education program?

3. What state services do you envision as necessary to implement the program at the local level?

4. How do you view your own leadership role in the implementation of local programs and what are the elements in your program that reflect this leadership?

FORM E

(To be completed by conference participants at end of session)

TITLE I-MIGRANT STATE EVALUATION CONFERENCE

August 1, 1978

Project Name: _____

This is designed to evaluate your individual project, not all Title I-Migrant projects as a group. Please answer all questions.

1. What educational changes occurred in your students as a result of the program?

2. Are the changes consistent enough to be educationally significant?

3. What is the non-educational impact of your program?

4. What other elements would you prefer to include in your program?

APPENDIX B

A.2. Particularly Successful Materials and Games
(Items mentioned more than once are starred)

WOIS, Employability Skills, A.P.
Story Starters
Competative things
Personal interest things
Art and Music Teachers
Tapes, cassettes*
Newspaper (6-8) reporter*
Language games
Consonant Bingo*
Space mural (read book, move up and eventually get the book etc., rocket move up.)
Productive activities
Magazines (older kids)
Concentration
Peabody Language Development Kits
Teacher - Student made materials
Finger painting
Name the animal
Gineau pig
Making popcorn*
Cooking pudding
Indoor games (London Bridge, Bluebird)
Finger plays*
BECP-Bilingual Early Childhood Program from Southwest Lab in Austin, Texas (3 level program for 3-5 year olds. Contains: motor, visual, auditory, ideas and concepts, English Syntex, Vocabulary, Pre-writing and Pre-math, Exploring and Discovery.)
Sesame Street
Guessing games
Songs
Dances
Creative Writing
Sharing time
Nature Walks
Role Playing
Serving selves food
Making bread, tortillas
Water play
Sand play
Planting seeds and watering
Plants

A.3. Activities Most Effective In Stimulating Learning

Field trips - trip to A.P. ***
Magician (kids wrote stories on how he did it)
Plays
Puppet shows
Putting an activity scrap book
Letters
Concert - Rock group
Walks
Specific activities, language experience
Froot Loop stringing
Animal pictures
Food pictures
Swimming
Coloring
Finger plays
Creative writing
Preparing own food
Children playing independently in the learning areas

A.5. New Methods or Procedures Tried

Sex-Health Education
Track meet
OBIS - Outdoor Biology - Packets
SQUIRT
Used a main idea for the week as a tool for establishing activities
Student helpers
Guidance kits
Woodworking
Recognizing names, months of the year
Jumping rope
Ioppenish Developmental Scale (Bureau for Education of the Handicapped)